

REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 19, 2003 with claims 1-36.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1-5, 9-14 and 16-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023679 to Johnson (hereinafter “Johnson”); (ii) rejected claims 6-8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0097410 to Atkins et al. (hereinafter “Atkins”); and (iii) rejected claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/00156693 to Stewart et al. (hereinafter “Stewart”).

In this response, Applicants traverse the various §102 and §103 rejections but amend the claims in an effort to expedite the application through to issuance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments above and remarks below.

Applicants maintain that the claim set prior to the above amendments was patentable over Johnson, Atkins, Stewart, and any combinations thereof. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 19, 29, 30 and 36 by incorporating the claim language from claim 14 (or claim 27, which contained similar content) in order to further clarify the claimed invention. Claims 14 and 27 have now been canceled.

As amended, the independent claims now further specify that the annotation data also comprises at least one hierarchical representation defining one or more of: (i) an indication of organizational data entities; (ii) a specification of collaborating entities; (iii) a specification of content type pertinent to the collaborating entities; (iv) a specification of access control information; (v) a specification of dependency information for the organizational data entities; and (vi) a specification of a type of business construct defining collaboration activity; such that the at least one other entity may utilize at least a portion of the annotation data defined in the at least one hierarchical representation.

The added language is intended to further clarify that the claimed annotation data is more than just “hyperlinks” or “uniform resource locator (URL).” Rather, such annotation data embodies an on-demand information exchange model which enables implementation of operations designed to achieve various goals, for example: (i) providing a flexible and uniform annotation representation for information exchange of various non-structured data without requiring pre-defined schemas; (ii)

automating the annotation data generation process; and (iii) capturing and automating business collaboration interaction patterns for information exchange based on the annotation data.

Paragraphs [0023] and [0027], newly cited by the Examiner in the present Office Action, merely indicate that Johnson discloses transmitting a conventional “URL of the content” between collaborating parties. This is clearly not equivalent to the claimed annotation data.

For at least this reason, Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 19, 29, 30 and 36 are patentable distinct over Johnson.

Dependent claims 2-4, 9-14, 16-18, 20-28 and 31-34 are allowable for at least the reasons identified above with regard to claims 1, 19 and 30. One or more of these claims are also believed to define separately-patentable subject matter over the cited art.

Independent claim 35 is directed to a method of deploying a business collaboration system, the method comprising the steps of: deploying at least one on-demand business collaboration hyperchain-based management apparatus for use in one or more of: defining at least one business collaboration process template; creating at least one set of data constructs; selecting at least one other collaborating entity for information exchange capable of acting on at least one set of business constructs; customizing a process template to support a selected set of business constructs; and generating at least one set of activities in a business construct with initial collaborative data entities.

The Examiner cites new reference Stewart in rejecting claim 35. However, Stewart fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 35.

For example, no where does Stewart disclose “customizing a process template to support a selected set of business constructs.” In fact, no where does Stewart even mention creation of “a process template.”

Accordingly, it is believed that the teachings of Stewart fail to meet the limitations of claim 35.

With regard to the rejection of claims 6-8 and 15 as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Atkins, Applicants assert that the Atkins fails to remedy the deficiencies described above with regard to Johnson. Thus, claims 6-8 and 15 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Claims 6-8 and 15 also recite patentable subject matter in their own right.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-13, 15-26 and 28-36 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102 and §103 rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

/William E. Lewis/

Date: November 21, 2007

William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946